



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,993	02/28/2002	Gail Beth Bynum	9015.145US01	6334
7:	590 08/11/2004		EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C. P.O. Box 2903			DESANTO, MATTHEW F	
	MN 55402-0903		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
• ,			3763	
				_

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

my

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	1 40			
Advisory Action	10/086,993	BYNUM, GAIL BET	н			
Advisory Addish	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Matthew F DeSanto	3763				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 08 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee lave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 17 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any parned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		•			
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment			
 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ req place the application in condition for allow 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ance because: See Continuation	<u>Sheet</u> .				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	•					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:		•				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen						
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner read through the remarks and was not persuaded because the prior art has the same structure as the claimed invention and according to the MPEP section 2114, the apparatus claim must be distinguishable from the prior art by structure not function. When the structure is the same the prior art is inherently capable of performing the function and therefore a patent cannot be granted. Therefore, the examiner suggests adding the structure elements to the claimed invention. .

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY FORTER 2700